

NEW EUROPE COLLEGE
REGIONAL PROGRAM



Les cultes des saints souverains et
des saints guerriers et l'idéologie du
pouvoir en Europe Centrale et Orientale

Actes du colloque international
17 janvier 2004,
New Europe College, Bucarest

Volume coordonné par
Ivan BILIARSKY et
Radu G. PĂUN

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

Copyright © 2007 – New Europe College

ISBN 978-973-88304-1-7

New Europe College

Str. Plantelor 21

023971 Bucharest

Romania

www.nec.ro; e-mail: nec@nec.ro

tel: (+40-21) 327.00.35; fax: (+40-21) 327.07.74

THE IMAGE OF THE IDEAL RULER IN MEDIEVAL BULGARIAN LITERATURE AND ART

Elka BAKALOVA

From medieval Bulgaria we have no surviving explicit text, spelling out the concept of Ideal Rulership. But we did have other sources providing verbal and pictorial information bearing on this question. I'll try to show some of those sources associated with the personality of Bulgarian King Ivan Alexander (1331-1371). I have chosen this particular case first because the 14th century, which closes the very important period of Bulgarian medieval culture, is still subject of incomplete research, incessant discussions and reappraisal of its values. On the other hand, Ivan Alexander is the only Bulgarian ruler of whom the comparatively largest number of portraits has come down to us. Arranged in chronological order they almost 'cover' his long and successful reign.

I.

I have recently worked on the text of a eulogy of Bulgarian King taken from a manuscript Psalter, commissioned by Ivan Alexander, written in Kouklen monastery in 1337, which is now in the Library of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences in Sofia (known therefore as Sofia Psalter of Ivan Alexander).¹ It

is interpolated after the Psalms and between the canticles (the 5th canticle of Isaiah). It is published,² usually regarded as a verbal “portrait”, and sometimes even as a “realistic” portrait of the Bulgarian King, written by an author “who is fully entitled to claim originality”. The Serbian scholar Đordje Trifunovic writes the following about this literary portrait:

“In his short eulogy of the Bulgarian King Ivan Alexander, written in the Psalter of 1337, the author conveys an unusual peculiarity about an upright walk with bent knees. Here it seems that among the literary topoi the copyist of the Psalter and author of the eulogy introduces a realistic feature: православиѣниша въ вѣсѣхъскыхъ, | старѣишинѣ же ѿ войнонаучѣника | ѿ вѣ вранехъ крѣпѣкааго, раунтелѣна же | ѿ влѣбѣшана, рѣмѣнѣно доброзрачѣнаго ѿ краснаго видѣмѣ, колѣноскѣжѣта ѿ правоходѣца, зрѣ сладѣко оучебѣна | вѣсѣхъ”.³

The Bulgarian scholar K. Kuev has a much more emphatic opinion:

“This is a work by a Bulgarian author, which should be credited with more originality than it has been so far.”

In his article entitled *The Image of Ivan Alexander in Middle Bulgarian poetry* (sic!), he defines it as a “solemn hymn”⁴, whereas L. Grasheva ascribes it to the genre of “rhetorical prose”.⁵ These contradictory opinions of prominent literary historians regarding the genre identity and the originality of this text provoked me to make my own study, the results of which I present below.⁶

The current study of the text yields the following results:

1. I shall dwell first on the question of the genre.

The whole structure of this short eulogy and all of its rhetorical devices without exception point to Menander's *ΠΕΡΙ ΕΠΙΔΕΙΚΤΙΚΩΝ*, a treatise of the famous teacher of rhetoric in Laodicea-on-Lycus (end of 3rd - beginning of 4th century), which provides directions for composing the so-called *βασιλικὸς λόγος*, i.e., the imperial oration, or the royal address.⁷ The imperial oration according to Menander is an encomium of the emperor:

"It will thus embrace a generally agreed amplification (αὔξησις) of the good things attaching to the emperor, but allows no ambivalent or disputed features, because of the extreme splendor of the person concerned."⁸

After the prooimion, i.e., the introduction, the author of such an oration must come to the topic of the native country of the emperor (πατρίς), of his family (γένος) and of his birth (γέννησις). But Menander is flexible and gives the possibility to vary the emphasis in the oration. So he notes:

"If neither his city nor his nation is conspicuously famous, you should omit this topic, and consider whether his family has prestige or not. If it has, work this up. If it is humble or without prestige, omit it likewise, and start with the emperor himself ..."⁹

Next comes the description of the nature (φύσις) and (ἀνατροφή) of the emperor and of his character or of his "accomplishments" (ἐπιτηδεύματα). After "accomplishments" comes the topic of 'actions' (πράξεις). Menander wrote:

“You should divide such ‘actions’ into times of peace and times of war, and put war first, if the subject of your praise has distinction in this. Actions of courage should come into consideration first in such subject: courage reveals an emperor more than do other virtues. If however, he has never fought a war (a rare circumstance), you have no choice but to proceed to peaceful topics.”¹⁰

It is clear from the discussion so far that the author of the eulogy of Ivan Alexander does not act just on his whim “first to portray the image of Ivan Alexander and then to consider his deeds”, as considered by K. Kuev,¹¹ but in this he demonstrates thorough familiarity with the principles of eulogy construction. The fact that “the rapture of the author is caused firstly of Ivan Alexander’s military feats” (K. Kuev)¹² is in fact a strict adherence to the compositional principles of the genre in Byzantine literature. Menander wrote:

“You should also describe the emperor’s own battles, and invest him with all impressiveness and knowledge, as Homer does for Achilles, Hector and Ajax.”¹³

Matters for our author of course were simplified as Ivan Alexander did indeed wage victorious campaigns and it was easy to “develop the theme well”. And namely here what was specific for King Ivan Alexander “penetrates chiefly as *content*, without changing the system of elements, building up the image”, as L. Grasheva correctly notes in the introduction to the book on the rhetorical prose in medieval Bulgarian literature.¹⁴

These brief quotations from the treatise of Menander should draw our attention to the fact that the author of the short eulogy of the Bulgarian King conforms to the recommended rules, or, better said, to the principles of this genre in Byzantine

literature. Thus, he is stretching the meaning of the wars and victories of Ivan Alexander, enumerating the fortified cities and all the territories he had conquered. And exactly according to Menander's instructions, as the encomium is on warlike actions, the author is speaking of them under the heading of courage, not under any other virtue. Further, exhorts Menander,

"always divide the actions of those you are going to praise into virtues, there are four virtues: courage (ἀνδρεία), justice (δικαιοσύνη), temperance (σωφροσύνη), and wisdom (φρόνησις) and see to what virtues the actions belong".¹⁵

Humanity (φιλανθρωπία) is the other virtue of the ruler pointed out by Menander. According to him,

"Justice is a portion of his humanity: for when victorious, the emperor did not reply the aggressors in kind, but divided his actions in just proportion between punishment and humanity".

And further:

"Under 'justice' you should commend mildness towards subjects, humanity towards petitioners and accessibility".¹⁶

Similar virtues of King Ivan Alexander are also pointed out in our text: he is called "righteous beyond words, judge of orphans and widows", "gracious", "benevolent", etc. So, our author exclaims:

"Who, among us, after having seen the King, would return grieving to his home?!"

There is another peculiarity of our text which is linked with the rhetorical prescriptions of Menander: the comparison of the Bulgarian King with Alexander the Great.

“In his military might he seems to me as second Alexander of ancient times. Like him [Ivan Alexander] from very beginning [of his reign] took many cities with fortitude and courage. So he appears before us, the great Ivan Alexander, ruling over all the Bulgarians, he, who has proven himself in difficult and hard battles; who has powerfully overcome the Greek King and when the latter was at a loss, he captured him and took the fortified towns: Nessebar [Messambria on the Black Sea] and all the Pomorie [the Black Sea Coast] together with Romania, as well as Bdin and all of the lower Danube even to the Morava river. The rest of the towns and villages, countries and countryside fell at his feet.”

Menander always recommends the techniques of comparison (συγκρίσις):

“Add also a comparison to each of the main heads, comparing nature with nature, upbringing with upbringing, education with education and so on, looking out also examples of Roman emperors or generals or the most famous of the Greeks.”¹⁷

The case of Alexander the Great is cited in several places as a key model:

“You must not forget our previous proposition, namely that comparisons should be made under each head; these comparisons, however, will be partial (e.g., education with education, temperance with temperance) whereas the complete one will concern the whole subject, as when

we compare a reign as a whole and in sum with another reign, e.g., the reign of Alexander with he present one.”¹⁸

Or:

“Come then and behold these things, come to add to our glories, to be our second Alexander.”¹⁹

2. It is necessary to emphasize that the rhetorical prescriptions of Menander find many illustrations in both pagan and Christian oratory.²⁰ But later, in the Byzantine tradition, we find a new, typically Christian layer of descriptive conventions – such for instance as comparisons with the mighty rulers of Biblical or Christian times (David, Solomon, or Constantine the Great). The so-called „Christian discourse“ underlines the grace and piety, the philanthropy and charity (εὐσέβεια) of the king.²¹ So, along with Menander’s rhetorical scheme for the praise of emperors our eulogy contains a lot of those typical for the Christian discourse descriptive conventions. The most important among them is the emphasis on the relationship between the Lord’s and the King’s power, accentuating the transmission of the power from Christ to the King, which is stressed in our text at a very beginning (“... let us praise God and sing a solemn song to Christ ... who had given to us the great commander and King of Kings.”). Such is also the comparison of Ivan Alexander with Constantine the Great:

“It seems to me that this King appeared as a new Constantine among the Kings in his faith and piety, heart and character, having as a scepter the triumphant Cross, when bearing and showing this standard he drove away and dismissed all resisting and arrogant forces ...”

These innovations occur as early as Constantine's day, for example in exemplary work representing Early Byzantine rhetorical prose, namely the Jubilee Oration of Eusebius of Caesarea *In Praise of Constantine*, delivered on 22 of May 337 on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the reign of the founder of Constantinople and the Eastern Roman Empire.²² From here on, they vary in the numerous eulogies of the successive emperors. Moreover, from here on Constantine becomes an imperial prototype, a point of reference, and symbol of imperial legitimacy and identity not only for the Byzantine, but also for all the orthodox rulers during the time of their existence.²³ From Tiberius to Michael VIII Palaeologus, who refers to himself as the "New Constantine", many Byzantine emperors either adopt the name Constantine or call themselves "the New Constantine". Paul Magdalino was justified when he recently entitled his book considering the problem *New Constantines. The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium. 4th-13th centuries*.²⁴ Constantine became not only "the most standard image" of Byzantine political ideology in the so-called *Fürstenspiegel*,²⁵ but also recommended as a model for rulers of other Orthodox states (even in a broader sense Christian). It suffices to recall the letter of Patriarch Photius to the Bulgarian King Boris-Michael.²⁶

This layer, let us call it the Christian layer, no doubt is traceable in the examined text. It simply matches the model recommended by Menander without any difficulties. From the very beginning, there is Praise of Christ, the Christian Lord:

"Let us praise God and sing a solemn song to Christ, the King-crown-giver and Lord (Master?) of us all who has given to us the great commander and King of Kings, the great Ivan Alexander, the most orthodox of all ..."

and in the second part, after the comparison with Alexander of Macedonia, comes the comparison with Constantine the Great. It is clear that the main theme of the eulogy of our author is the military successes and consolidation of the state resulting from the activity of the Bulgarian King (a theme also considered basic by Menander). The comparison with Alexander the Great allows the emphasizing of the military might of the King, while the comparison with Constantine, to explain what lies behind the victories of the King. In fact, it is meaningless to recall that the comparison with Constantine the Great occurs in other texts, as well as in the fine arts, as is the case with the Ossuary of the Bachkovo Monastery, where the portrait of King Ivan Alexander is compared with the portraits of Saints Constantine and Helena.²²

3. The last part or the epilogue of our eulogy does not exclude the rules of Menander, but displays one of the ways they could be modified. Menander wrote:

"The epilogue should be elaborated by having regard to the scope of the subject, representing the inhabitants greeting the governor: 'We have come to meet you, all of us, in whole families, children, old men, adults, priestly clans, associations of public men, the common people, greeting you with joy, all welcoming you with cries of praise, calling you our savior and fortress, our bright star...' "²⁷

And after this,

"you must utter a prayer, beseeching God that the emperor's reign may endure long, and the throne be handed down to his children and his descendants."²⁸

The author of our eulogy follows the prescriptions almost literally. He wrote:

“Come forth now, you patriarchs and bishops, monks and ascetics, judges, slaves and freemen, dignitaries and all the army; and rejoice with unexpressed joy and render glory to the great King Christ our God, the wreath-giver and raise to him your victorious song: Oh, Holy Trinity, save the Bulgarian King, protect and strengthen him, give him victory over his enemies and endow him with longevity, O Lord of us all...”

Both the glorification of Christ and the subsequent address to the Holy Trinity as well as the following series of *chairetismoi* (“Rejoice, o King of The Bulgarians, King of Kings. Rejoice chosen by God, Rejoice o merciful, Rejoice, o crowned by God! Rejoice guarded by God! Rejoice leader in war-times! Rejoice intercessor of the faithful!...”) borrowed from Byzantine hymnography belong undoubtedly to the so-called Christian layer of conventions and are characteristic of the eulogies of a number of Byzantine emperors. Such eulogies are clearly influenced by the Acathistos Hymn of the Virgin as well as by the eulogies of saints in medieval Bulgarian literature.²⁹

As we noted above, it is also Menander who prescribes a description of the populace welcoming the king to be included in the epilogue. Moreover, I would like to point out that the whole mise-en-scène with the cheering crowd, raising banners, and representatives of all layers of society greeting the king with victorious songs inevitably reminds us the ceremony of *adventus*, which was developed in the Roman antiquity, but in use throughout the Middle Ages on occasions of triumphal

entry of a ruler. It is on such occasions that the whole populace – men, women, old and young, and children – welcome the procession with a variety of gestures, chants, and acclamations.³⁰

4. I would like to note very briefly a few things about the description of the appearance of the king in the eulogy. Here too, the author follows the Byzantine literary models. Among the most conventional descriptions of the appearance of the emperor in the Byzantine encomiastic literature can be seen here “pink-cheeked, kind-sighted and good-looking”, all of them traits inherited from portrait descriptions of antiquity. The encomium, to quote Michael Psellus, describes

“what is a decoration for the soul of the character of the hero, which endows his physical nature with beauty and what is given to the hero from his origins and is illuminated by the Lord”.³¹

These requirements are also kept in other genre forms, especially when referring to the appearance of the Emperor. Thus, the same Psellus in his *Chronographia* characterizes Basil II as

“suspicious of everyone, a haughty and secretive man, ill-tempered, and irate with those who failed to carry out his wishes”.³²

He also adds:

“Terrible then was the vengeance he took on miscreant”

or

“where he had burst out in anger against someone; he did not quickly moderate his wrath”³³.

However, when referring to the appearance of the emperor he is closer to the encomiastic standard, even when this is in contradiction with the previous text. Moreover, the author himself notes this contradiction, beginning with a description in the following manner:

“So much for his character. As for his personal appearance, it betrayed the natural nobility of the man, for his eyes were light-blue and fiery, the eye-brows not overhanging nor sullen, not yet extended in one straight line, like a women’s, but well-arched and indicative of his pride. The eyes were neither deep-set (a sign of knavishness and cunning) nor yet too prominent (a sign of frivolity), but they shone with brilliance that was manly. His whole face was rounded off, as if from center into a perfect circle, and joined to the shoulders by a neck that was firm and not too long. His chest was neither thrust out in front of him, nor hanging on him, so to speak, nor again was it concave and, as it were, cramped; rather was it the mean between the two extremes, and the rest of his body was in harmony with it.”³⁴

So where are the live individual features?

5. Further, in our text we come to the ambivalent and most disputed feature of the Bulgarian king: “with bent knees and upright walking”. The difficulty stems from the fact that this characterization is placed in the text **on the borderline**

between the description of the king's appearance and the enumeration of his moral qualities. A traditional way of interpreting this has been to take it as referring to the physical description of the King. The problem is that if this sense is intended, then the language is curiously oblique and unclear. And as these features are placed on **the borderline between the description of the king's appearance and the enumeration of his moral qualities** there could be a connection with the following qualities considered specific to Christian moral virtues, as for instance "the most orthodox among all". As such, the elements of this characterization should be also related to the moral virtues of the King. For the following two descriptions, namely "gazing sweetly over all, righteous beyond words, judge of orphans and widows" positively stand for the important qualities "charity, humanity" and "justice" which we have already discussed.

The bent knees, which unambiguously remind us of the *proskynesis* pose, are undoubtedly a calque from Greek "κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου", as it is used, for example, in the *Epistle of Apostle Paul to the Ephesians 3, 14.* :

“Τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα” (“For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ”).

The same words are to be found in the commentaries of Origen on the mentioned Epistle of Apostle Paul to the Ephesians:

“[τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.] [Ὁριγένης φησί] τὸ κάμπτειν τὰ γόνατα σύμβολόν ἐστιν ἄλλης γονυκλισίας τῆς γινομένης ἐν τῷ

ὑποτάσσεσθαι τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ὑποπεπτωκέναι αὐτῷ. τούτῳ γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολός φησιν ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμπτη ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, καὶ λέγομεν μὴ πάντως τὰ ἐπουράνια ἔχειν σώματα γεγονατωμένα, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὰ καταχθόνια ὁμοίως, πρὸς τούτοις οὐδὲ τὰς ἀπηλλαγμένας τούτου τοῦ σώματος ψυχάς.³⁵

(“Origen says: The bending of the knees is a symbol of another genuflection done in submission to God and subjection of his authority. The Apostle also uses this expression to refer to the need for the knees of all those in Heaven and those on Earth and those under the Earth, to bend in the name of Christ, and we say this about those who are in the Heavens who have no bodies with knees, and also those under the Earth in the same way, as well as the souls which have been liberated from this body.”). The bent knees of the King point out his piety and his homage to Christ. Sometimes this verb is substituted by the verb “προσκυνέω”.³⁶

The “upright walk” derives from Greek ῥθοποδέω as it is used, for example, in the *Epistle of Apostle Paul to the Galatians 2, 14*:

“ἀλλ’ ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου” (“But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter before them all...”),

or from “ὀρθὰ βαδίζειν”, which has a similar meaning.

This verb is to be found in the Homily of St John Chrysostom on Matthew:

“Οὐ γὰρ οὕτω γενναίας καὶ νεανικῆς ἐστὶ ψυχῆς ὀρθὰ βαδίζειν καὶ διόλου τρέχειν (ἔχει γὰρ ἡ τοιαύτη συνοδοιπόρον τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐλπίδα, ἀλείφουσιν, διεγείρουσιν, νευροῦσιν, προθυμοτέραν ἐργαζομένην), ὥς τὸ μετὰ τοὺς μυρίους στεφάνους καὶ τὰ πολλὰ τρόπαια καὶ τὰς νίκας, τὴν ἐσχάτην ὑπομείναςαν ζημίαν, δυνηθῆναι πάλιν ἐπιλαβέσθαι τῶν αὐτῶν δρομῶν.”³⁷

The meaning of the whole passage runs as follows:

“and it is not characteristic in this way of the courageous/noble and youthful soul to walk upright without running (for this soul has as its traveling companion good hope, which stimulates, raises up, gives courage, makes more eager), so that after many wreaths and trophies and victories, and having undergone the utmost suffering, it will be able to return to the same road.”³⁸

The tradition within which we consider our eulogy is a canon of well-established commonplaces for composing the imperial oration. P. Magdalino wrote:

“The frequency with which the emperor was praised made the imperial image a stereotype. Yet it also ensured that the stereotype was infinitely variable”.³⁹

Let me quote L. Grasheva from the introduction to the volume on Rhetorical Prose in medieval Bulgaria:

“Each canonical art, which also constitutes the solemn rhetoric of the Middle Ages, realizes its esthetic norms through an unlimited number of variations.”⁴⁰

Therefore, it is not possible to find two identical imperial encomiums, and neither of them follows Menander's instructions literally. What the Byzantine encomiasts, as well as the Bulgarian author of the Eulogy for Tsar Ivan Alexander, draw from Menander and other sources is not a literally copied model, but a collection of structured principles, motifs and techniques which appear in no end of combinations and variants.

"The successful encomium, as P. Magdalino pointed out, was the one which, through imaginative use of Amplification and Comparison, made old *topoi* look as good as new."⁴¹

Such, we think, is the case in the eulogy of King Ivan Alexander in the Sofia Psalter.

II.

As I mentioned, Ivan Alexander is the only Bulgarian ruler of whom the largest number of portraits has come down to us.

1. The earliest of them are preserved among the miniatures of the Bulgarian manuscript translation of *The Chronicle of Constantine Manasses* (now in the Vatican Library, cod. Slavo 2) which is dated 1344-1345.⁴² On f.1 Ivan Alexander is depicted in garments identical to those worn by the Byzantine Emperor, and standing on a red subpedaneum. An angel is shown above him, placing a second crown on his head; Jesus Christ is on the King's right side (in the left part of the composition), half-turned towards him and holding a scroll in his hand, while on his other side stands the author of the Chronicle, Constantine Manasses (ill. 11). There is no doubt

that this image reproduces in general a Byzantine iconographic formula. The angel with the crown above Ivan Alexander means that the King, as a Byzantine Emperor, receives his authority from heaven. According to Hans Belting, the Byzantine protograph (i.e., Byzantine manuscript version of the Chronicle) had no such initial miniature, and the Bulgarian craftsman used as his model the donor compositions in the *chrysobullae* of the Byzantine Emperors. But he did not follow them directly. The very fact that Christ was removed from the center and “degraded” to the position of one of the figures accompanying the Bulgarian King excludes the use of an existing Byzantine model.⁴³ In any case, Byzantine models were not mechanically copied, but were given a new meaning or changed, depending on wishes of our donor.⁴⁴ This phenomenon, as we saw, was also characteristic in other spheres of cultural life in the fourteenth century.⁴⁵

2. The next image of Ivan Alexander on f. 91 is particularly interesting from the viewpoint of artistic media in expressing the concept of the ideal ruler within a framework of the Orthodox ideology.⁴⁶ Ivan Alexander is depicted there with King David blessing him, and with an angel offering him a sword, the symbol of the divine origin of royal power. The text written on the scroll of King David, part of Psalm 21 (called *A Royal Psalm of Salvation*), is also a eulogy of the royal power (ill. 9).⁴⁷ This iconographic formula is purely Byzantine (although no example of a similar composition in Byzantine art could be quoted). Anyhow, it is due to the tradition (mentioned above) of comparing the Byzantine Emperor to Old Testament personalities who combined spiritual and worldly power. Constantine the Great was already called not only a “new Moses” (by Eusebius of Caesarea), but also “savior

of the chosen peoples" and a "new David". This appellation was later given to other Emperors, comparisons between David and Basil I being particularly frequent.⁴⁸ The idea of putting forward Ivan Alexander as a successor of King David, who was considered the ideal type of ruler, can be taken as a *sui generis* form of legitimizing the Bulgarian king's claim not only to the Bulgarian, but also to the Byzantine throne.⁴⁹ It is not fortuitous that in his title the formula "King of all Bulgarians and Greeks" was used.

3. This formula is to be found accompanying the particularly representative portrait of Ivan Alexander in the Ossuary of Bachkovo monastery, dating from the period after 1344, when this region, together with Bachkovo monastery, was ceded to Ivan Alexander by the Byzantine Empress Anne of Savoy in exchange for the assistance she was promised in her struggle against John Cantacuzenus. The inscription, very damaged today, read:

"Yoan by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ King and Autokrator of the Bulgarians and the Romai Alexander."⁵⁰

Ivan Alexander is depicted full face, dressed in an imperial *sakkos*, ornamented with embroidered bands on sleeves (*perivrachia*) and a gold *loros* covered with pearls and precious stones, one end of which is thrown over the King's arm. Flying angels are crowning his head with a tall domed crown. He holds a cross in his right hand, and in his left an *akakia*, insignia of royal power, adopted from Byzantium (ill. 10). The garments and insignia, as well as the iconographic schema in the portrait of the Bulgarian King, follow the established formula for depicting the Byzantine Emperor.⁵¹

4. The garments and insignia of Ivan Alexander in the miniatures of the famous Gospel, commissioned by him, which is now in the Manuscripts Department of the British Library (the so called *London Tetraevangelium*, or the Curzon Bible), are all the same as in the previous manuscript.⁵² As S. Der Nersessian has shown, a Byzantine manuscript Tetraevangelium of the 11th century (Cod. Paris. gr.74) or another copy of it was taken as the prototype of this codex.⁵³ It was natural that in this case some iconographic schemata at hand were used in creating the illuminations of the Bulgarian manuscript. As the person who commissioned the manuscript, Ivan Alexander appears in the miniatures several times. On f. 88v., under the image of Christ sending the Twelve Apostles off to preach, the King is seen in an attitude of prayer, receiving the blessing of St. Matthew the Evangelist. A cursory glance at the respective miniature of the Byzantine protograph (on f.61 v.) is sufficient to register the striking similarity of the composition, but instead of the King there is a figure in a monk's garb, which depicts the Abbot of Stoudion monastery in Constantinople. (The difference is also that Matthew is stretching the book out to the Abbot and is not blessing him). New studies assign the Paris. gr.74 to the production of the Stoudion scriptorium.⁵⁴

5. In the same way, Ivan Alexander replaces the abbot between Abraham and the Holy Virgin in the Garden of Paradise in the miniature depicting The Last Judgment (f. 124v., and f. 93v. of Paris. gr. 74) and expresses his hope of taking the respective place in the Paradise.

6. Further on, on f. 134, below the composition of The Ascension, Ivan Alexander is again depicted in an attitude of prayer, receiving the blessing of St. Mark (ill. 4). And here the

composition entirely repeats f. 101v. of the Byzantine original (with a small difference in the gesture of the Evangelist), including even the form and decoration of the double arch under which the figures are depicted. At the end of the Gospel of St. Luke (f. 212v.) the King is depicted full face, receiving the blessing of St. Luke, and behind the figures their attributes have been painted: behind Ivan Alexander a shield, spear and sword, and behind St. Luke a writing desk. And although in the Greek manuscript the respective miniature is missing (the folio has been lost),⁵⁵ the image has been very closely followed, as is the case in the last miniature with St. John the Evangelist (f. 272v., see ill. 5).

7. The comparison between the last two donor miniatures is of considerable importance for us. It elucidates the essence of the complete donor iconography of the eleventh-century Stoudion Codex. And hence, the possible grounds for using it in the illumination of a fourteenth-century Bulgarian manuscript, as well as the introduction of certain changes. In the f. 213 of Paris. gr. 74 St. John the Theologian is handing the abbot's staff to a monk who has been chosen to heal the monastery brotherhood, and the Lord's right hand is thrust in blessing between the two arches. Here again the symbolic transmission of power (investiture) is depicted, only that this time the post of the abbot is emphasized as a symbol of spiritual power, which ensues from Christ and is transferred through the earthly servants of the Church. The sense of the scene is further elucidated by the poetic text written below it. It stresses the fact that the abbot's power comes from heaven, from the heavenly Jerusalem, and that the staff, the sign of spiritual leadership, is a gift of God. This iconographic formula, although not so widespread as that of the investiture of the

Emperor, is nevertheless well known from the miniatures in certain eleventh-century Byzantine manuscripts. What is more, its presence usually offers grounds to connect the manuscript containing it with the production of the Stoudion scriptorium, although, as Ioannis Spatharakis rightly observes, a similar scene would be quite regular and comprehensive in every monastery and in every milieu of monks.⁵⁶ It is obvious that the ideas on which both iconographic formulae are founded were similar – a symbolical transmission of secular (state) and spiritual power – and were expressed in a similar way. But the use of a Byzantine model was in no case blind, a mechanical copying, but a result of the profound understanding of its ideological content. The changes in the iconography of this last scene, though insignificant at first sight, are eloquent evidence of this. In the Bulgarian manuscript, the heavenly segment with the Lord's benedictory right hand is missing. This fact already means that the theme was changed and that no transmission of power under the wing of the Lord was in question. Here St. John the Evangelist transmits to King Ivan Alexander not the abbot's staff (which would be an absurdity), but a book. He offers him as an annunciation the Word of God, the finished Tetraevangelium. Thus, the iconographic model is transformed and given a new sense of bringing Ivan Alexander to the fore as the man who commissioned the manuscript codex. And the codex is symbolically offered to him as a personal gift by St. John the Theologian, the King's patron and heavenly protector.

8. However, this does not mean that the themes of the relationship between the Lord's and the King's power, between the heavenly and the earthly ruler, is in general excluded from the ideological content of the miniatures which illuminate the

London Gospel of Ivan Alexander. On the contrary, it has found its place at the very beginning of the manuscript and is expressed in a large donor composition which covers two of its first folios (f. 2v. and f. 3, see ill. 1 and 2) and which is missing in the Greek prototype. King Ivan Alexander is depicted with the members of his family in “extended royal iconography”, which is a phenomenon typical of the Palaeologan period, as André Grabar observed a long time ago.⁵⁷ The purpose of this, as well as of similar images, was simultaneously to embody the idea of the divine origin of the King’s rule and the dynastic idea, by depicting the heirs to the throne together with their reigning parents. Ivan Alexander is under the heavenly segment with the benedictory Hands of the Lord. His second wife Theodora and his two sons are with him; and on f. 2v. the whole “female” part of the royal family is to be seen together with the son-in-law, Despot Constantine (ill. 2). But the royal (as well as the imperial) “family portraits” served not only for bringing officially to the fore “those portrayed”, but, as Klaus Wessel aptly noted, “above all, for dynastic propaganda”,⁵⁸ at the establishing of new dynasty, at the change of the heir to the throne, etc. In the miniature of the London Gospel the “dynastic propaganda” is expressed through the insignia and official distinctions, as well as through the inscriptions and nuances in the garments. The new heir presumptive to the throne, flanked by his parents, is Ivan Shishman, called “tsar” like his father and “son of the great King Ivan Alexander”, not merely “King’s son” as the younger Ivan Assen is called. Ivan Shishman is clothed in the same garments as his father, wears the same crown and is standing on the same purple cushion etc.⁵⁹ All this shows that he had already been proclaimed the co-ruler with his father. Along with the title “son-Tsar” which is found in both *The chronicle*

of Manasses and *The London Tetraevangelium* to designate the son-co-ruler and heir to the throne, the title of the “young Tsar” is used, which is also applied to Ivan Sratsimir in the *Bdin Tetraevangelium* of Metropolitan Daniil, preserved in the British Museum (Add. Mss. 396525).⁶⁰ The closest parallel in ideological content, iconography and composition is provided by the miniature forming the frontispiece with the image of Manuel II Palaeologus, Empress Elena and their three children, which illuminates a manuscript of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, presented by the Emperor to the Paris Monastery of Saint Denis (ill. 7)⁶¹

In the existing portraits of Ivan Alexander, as in the composition from the London Gospels, the King himself, as well as his relations, is depicted in strict correspondence with the etiquette prescribed by the Byzantine court, which also regulated the details of costume according to the place of each personality in the court hierarchy. In the royal portraits, Bulgarian painting is the closest to the Byzantine art.⁶² As to the “characterization” of those portrayed, it was in line with the ideals of immobility, balance, inner proportion and normativity which were the principal features of portraits for the Byzantine writers and artists (as it was in general the case with the aesthetics of the Byzantines) since earlier times. As well as even in that part of the studied eulogy, where real things are apparently spoken of, frequently repeated formulae are discovered, reaching right back to Late Antiquity and preserved in Byzantine rhetorical prose. The medieval writer and artist did not so much depict the personality

“as they transformed and ‘embellished’ it, making it ceremonious. They are masters of ceremonies. They use their formulae as signs and give life the form of a parade, keeping to the rules of decorum.”⁶³

These several examples draw the attention to the existence in the fourteenth-century literature and visual art of similar pictorial principles (within the framework of the artistic media specific to every art) as an expression of a unified ideological and artistic concept. I hope that this study which began with the text of an unknown scribe has given access to a “splendid theater” (the notion belongs to Sabine McCormack) where art and literature can be seen “as united in a single communication”.⁶⁴



Illustration 1: The Bulgarian tsar Ivan Alexander and his family : Ivan Shisman, Theodora, Ivan Assen, The *Gospel* of London (or Curzon *Gospel*), British Library, Add. Ms. 39627, fol. 3r.



Illustration 2: Constantin Dragaș, Ivan Alexander's son-in-law, Tamara, Maria and Desislava, *The Gospel of London* (or *Curzon Gospel*), British Library, Add. Ms. 39627, fol. 2v.



Illustration 3: Tsar Ivan Alexander between Abraham and the Holy Virgin in the Garden of Paradise, *The Gospel of London* (or *Curzon Gospel*), British Library, Add. Ms. 39627, fol. 124.



Illustration 4: Saint Mark blessing tsar Ivan Alexander, The *Gospel of London* (or *Curzon Gospel*), British Library, Add. Ms. 39627, fol. 144.



Illustration 5: Saint John offers a book (Gospel) to the tsar Ivan Alexander, *The Gospel of London* (or *Curzon Gospel*), British Library, Add. Ms. 39627, fol. 144, fol. 272v.



Illustration 6: John VI Cantacuzenus as emperor and monk
Joasaph, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Ms. gr. 1242,
fol. 123v



Illustration 7: Manuel II Palaeologus, Empress Elena and their three children. Manuscript Ivories 100, Musée du Louvre, fol. 2r.



Illustration 8: Manuel Palaeologus, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Suppl. gr. 309.



Illustration 9: King David blessing the tsar Ivan Alexander, *Chronicle of Constantine Manasses*, Cod. Vat. Slavo 2, fol. 91v.



Illustration 10: Ivan Alexander, Bačkovo ossuary, narthex, North wall, XIVe s.



Illustration 11: Tsar Ivan Alexander between the Christ and the author of the *Chronicle*, *Chronicle of Mannasses*, Cod. Vat. Slavo 2, fol. 1.

NOTES

- ¹ This part of the article was prepared during my stay in Munich and Berlin at the invitation of Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. I would especially like to thank Prof. Dr. Franz Tinnfeldt of the Institut für Byzantinistik, Neugriechische Philologie und Byzantinische Kunstgeschichte at Munich University and Prof. Dr. Dieter R. Reinsch of the Byzantinisch-Neugriechisches Seminar at Freie Universität in Berlin, with whom I had the chance to discuss some issues.
- ² The text is published by B. Tsonev: "*Славянски ръкописи в Българската академия*", *Сб. БАН*, VI, 1916, 10-11. Cf. Hr. Kodov, *Опис на славянските ръкописи в Библиотеката на Българската Академия на науките*, Sofia, 1969, 11-16. The translation in modern Bulgarian language is done by I. Dujcev, *Из старата българска книжнина*, II, Sofia, 1944, 69-72; cf. P. Dinekov, K. Kuev, D. Petkanova, *Христоматия по старобългарска литература*, Sofia, 1961, 274-275; P. Dinekov, *Старобългарски страници. Антология*, Sofia, 1966, 54-55.
- ³ Dj. Trifunović, *Портрет у српској средновековној книжевности*, Kruševac, 1971, 19.
- ⁴ K. Kuev, "Образът на Иван Александър в среднобългарската поезия", in *Българско средновековие. Българо-съветски сборник в чест на 70-годишнината на проф. И. Дуйчев*, Sofia, 1980, 256.
- ⁵ *Стара българска литература, II. Ораторска проза*, directed by L. Grasheva, Sofia, 1982, 146-147.
- ⁶ A preliminary publication of this study is to be found in: E. Bakalova, "Портретът на цар Иван Александър от Софийския песнивец: „реализъм“ или компилация от топоси?", in *Словенско средновековно наследство. Сборник посветен на професору Ђорђе Трифуновићу*, Belgrad, 2002, 45-58.
- ⁷ H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, München, 1978, I, 80, 88f., 90-93, 105, 121f., 132f., 134. Cf. G. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate*, London, 1978, 37. D. Russel, "Epideictic Practice and Theory", in: *Menander Rhetor*. Edited with translation and commentary by D.A. Russell and N.G. Wilson, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1981, XI-XLIV; Cf. *Idem*, "The Panegyrist and their Teachers", in: *The Propaganda of Power. The Role of Pangegyric in late Antiquity*, M. Whitby (ed.), Leiden-Boston-Köln 1998, 17-53.

- ⁸ *Menander Rhetor*, cited above, 76-77.
- ⁹ *Ibidem*, 80-81.
- ¹⁰ *Ibidem*, 84-85.
- ¹¹ K. Kuev, *op. cit.*, 256.
- ¹² *Ibidem*, 257.
- ¹³ *Menander Rhetor...*, 86-87.
- ¹⁴ L. Grasheva, "Поглед към старобългарската ораторска проза", in: *Стара българска литература. II. Ораторска проза*, Sofia, 1982, 19.
- ¹⁵ *Menander Rhetor*, 84-85.
- ¹⁶ *Ibidem*, 88-89.
- ¹⁷ *Ibidem*, 84-85.
- ¹⁸ *Ibidem*, 92-93.
- ¹⁹ *Ibidem*, 186-187.
- ²⁰ Of the quite extensive bibliography, see in particular *The Propaganda of Power ...*, cited above, note 9.
- ²¹ The term "Christian discourse" belongs to Averil Cameron. "I mean by it all the rhetorical strategies and manners of expression that I take to be particularly characteristic of Christian writing.", A. Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991, 5.
- ²² See for instance the following quotations: "Thus outfitted *in the likeness of the kingdom of heaven*, he pilots affairs below with an upward raised gaze, to steer by archetypal form He grows strong in his model of monarchic rule, which the Ruler of All has given to the race of man alone of those on earth." (H. A Drake, *In Praise of Constantine. A Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius' Tricennal Oration*, Berkley-Los Angeles-London, 1976, III(5), 87), or "No human eye has seen this, nor any ear discerned it, for it is not possible for the mind encased in flesh to discern what things are prepared for *those grace and piety, such as yourself, most God-fearing sovereign*, to whom alone of those who have yet been here since the start of time has the All-Ruling God Himself given power to purify human life, to *whom He has revealed even His own Saving Sign, by which He prevailed over death and fashioned a triumph over His enemies.*" (*Ibidem*, VI(18), 94), etc.
- ²³ Of the quite extensive bibliography, see in particular: O. Treitinger, *Die oströmische Kaiser und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung in höfischen Zeremoniel vom oströmischen Staats- und Reichsgedanken*, Darmstadt, 1956, 129-134. A. Linder, "The Myth of Constantine the

- Great in the West: Sources and Hagiographic Commemorations", in: *Studi Medievali*, 16 (1975), 43-95. H. Hunger, *op. cit.*, 72, 249, 280, 286. A. Kazhdan, "'Constantine imaginaire'. Byzantine Legends of the Ninth Century about Constantine the Great", in: *Byzantion* 57 (1987), 196-250. D. Nicol, *The Immortal Emperor*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992. N. Radošević, "Константин Велики у 'Царским говорима'", in: *Зборник Радова Византолошког института*, XXXIII, 1994, 7-19. I am grateful to Nina Radošević for the recommendations and the attention to my ideas.
- ²⁴ P. Magdalino (ed.), *New Constantines. The Rhythm of Imperial Renewal in Byzantium. 4th-13th centuries*, Variorum, Aldershot, 1994.
- ²⁵ W. Blum, *Byzantinische Fürstenspiegel. Agapetos, Theophylakt von Ochrid, Thomas Magister*, Stuttgart, 1981, 102, 140. H. Hunger, *op. cit.*, 157-165. G. Prinzing, "Beobachtungen zu 'integrierten' Fürstenspiegeln der Byzantiner" in: *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 38, 1988, 1-33.
- ²⁶ "You have done a deed which compares with the achievement of the great Constantine." (See the English translation in: D. Stratiudaki White and J. R. Berrigan (ed.), *The Patriarch and the Prince. The Letter of Patriarch Photios of Constantinople to Khan Boris of Bulgaria*, Brookline, Massachusetts, 1982, 56.
- ²⁷ *Menander Rhetor*, 100-101.
- ²⁸ *Ibidem*, 94-95.
- ²⁹ K. Kuev, *op. cit.*, 258.
- ³⁰ E. Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae. A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1946. S. MacCormack, "Change and Continuity in Late Antiquity: The Ceremony of Adventus", in: *Historia*, 21 (1972), 721-752. Cf. S. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, 1981. M. McCormick, *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- ³¹ Cf. E.H. Ljubarskij, *Михаил Пселл. Личность и творчество*, Moscow, 1978, 231. Cf. P. Gautier, "Basilikoi logoi de Psellos", in: *Siculorum gymnasium*, vol. 33, 1980, 717-771 passim.
- ³² *The Chronographia of Michael Psellus*, Translated from Greek by E.R.A. Sewter, London, 1953, 19.
- ³³ *Ibidem*, 27.
- ³⁴ *Ibidem*, 27.

- ³⁵ Origen, *Fragmenta ex commentariis in epistulam ad Ephesios*, sect. 15, line 1-7, Eph. III:14. Cf. Athanasius, *De morbo et valetudine*, (fr) page 5, line 9-14.

Κορινθίους <β ἐπιστολῇ> “Εἰ καὶ ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται, ἀλλ’ ὁ ἔσω ἀνακαινοῦται, ἐν δὲ τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους: “Τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται, ἵνα δῶ ὑμῖν κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρ-

Eriphanius, *Panarion* (56 *Adversus haereses*), vol. 3, p. 274, line 19-28.

ἡ δὲ ἐκκλησία πεπίστευκεν ὅτι θεὸς οὐ μόνον ἐστὶ κτίστης κτισμάτων (τοῦτο γὰρ Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ Ἕλληνες ἐπίστανται), ἀλλ’ ὅτι καὶ πατὴρ ἐστὶ μονογενοῦς, οὐ μόνον τὴν κτιστικὴν ἔχων ἐνέργειαν, ἀφ’ ἧς κτίστης νοεῖται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰδίως καὶ μονογενῶς γεννητικὴν καθ’ ἣν πατὴρ μονογενοῦς ἡμῖν νοεῖται. τοῦτο γὰρ παιδεύων ἡμᾶς ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος γράφει “τούτου γὰρ χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται”. <ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ γῆς πατέρες ὀνομάζονται>, καθ’ ὁμοιότητα τῶν οἰκείων οὐσιῶν τοὺς υἱοὺς ἔχοντες, οὕτω καὶ πατὴρ ἐν οὐρανοῖς ὀνομάζεται...

Basilus, *De baptismo libri duo*, vol. 31, p. 1561, line 20-28.

Διὰ τούτων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ὁ Κύριος τοὺς γεννηθέντας ἐκ πνεύματος πνεῦμα γενέσθαι λέγει. Συμμαρτυρεῖ δὲ ὁ Ἀπόστολος, λέγων: “Τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐξ οὗ πᾶσα πατριὰ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται. ἵνα δῶ ὑμῖν κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστόν

I have located these passages with the help of the TLG.

- ³⁶ Septuaginta, Paralipomenon I sive Chronicon I, 19,1 - 21,3.

καὶ Σαλωμων τῷ υἱῷ μου δὸς καρδίαν ἀγαθὴν ποιεῖν τὰς ἐντολάς σου καὶ τὰ μαρτύριά σου καὶ τὰ προστάγματα σου καὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ τέλος ἀγαγεῖν τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ οἴκου σου. καὶ εἶπεν Δαυιδ πάση τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Εὐλογήσατε κύριον τὸν θεὸν ὑμῶν. καὶ εὐλόγησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία κύριον τὸν θεὸν τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν καὶ κάμψαντες τὰ γόνατα προσεκύνησαν τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ. καὶ ἔθυσεν Δαυιδ τῷ κυρίῳ θυσίας καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν

όλοκαυτώματα τῷ θεῷ τῇ ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας, μόσχους χιλίους, κριοὺς χιλίους, ἄρνας χιλίους καὶ τὰς σπονδὰς αὐτῶν καὶ θυσίας εἰς πληθος παντὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ

Basiliius, *In ebriosos*, CPG 2858. PG 31, 444-464.

Ἀσματα πόρνῃς φθέγγῃ, ἐκβαλὼν τοὺς ψαλμοὺς καὶ τοὺς ὕμνους, οὓς ἐδιδάχθης. Κινεῖς πόδας, καὶ ἐξάλλῃ ἐμμανῶς, καὶ χορεύεις ἀχόρευτα, δέον τὰ γόνατα κάμπτειν εἰς τὴν προσκύνῃσιν: Τίνας ὁδύρωμαῖτάς κόρας τὰς ἀπειρογάμους; ἢ τὰς ἐν τῷ ζυγῷ τοῦ γάμου κατεχομένας; Αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐπανῆλθον, τὴν παρθενίαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν· αἱ δὲ τὴν σωφροσύνην τοῖς ἀνδράσιν οὐκ ἐπανήγαγον.

³⁷ PG 57, 342, 18.

³⁸ I am grateful to Prof. Peter Mackridge for his help in translating these difficult passages of Origen and St. John Chrysostom.

³⁹ P. Magdalino, "The Emperor and His Image", in: P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180*, Cambridge University Press, 1993, 418.

⁴⁰ L. Grasheva, "Поглед върху старобългарската ораторска проза..." , cited above, 14.

⁴¹ P. Magdalino, *op. cit.*, 418.

⁴² B. Filov. *Les miniatures de la Chronique de Manassès à la Bibliothèque du Vatican (Cod. vat. slav. II)*, Sofia, Musée National Bulgare, 1927. Cf. Idem, *Миниатюрите на Манасиевата хроника във Ватиканската библиотека*, Sofia, 1937; I. Dujcev, *The miniatures of the Chronicle of Manasse*, Sofia, Bulgarski Houdozhnik Pub. House, 1963. Idem, *Миниатюрите на Манасиевата летопис*, Sofia, 1962.

⁴³ H. Belting, *Das illuminierte Buch in der spätbyzantinischen Gesellschaft*, Heidelberg, 1970, 21. Dujcev (*op. cit.*, 32) assumes that the image of the Byzantine Emperor Manuel I. Komnenos (1140-1180) was used as a model for this initial miniature, the *Chronicle* having been written during his reign. But according to I. Bozhilov ("Ватиканският Манасий (Cod.Vat. Slavo 2). Текст и миниатюра", in: *Проблеми на изкуството*, 1966, 2,3-12) the illumination of the old Bulgarian translation of the *Chronicle* was commissioned by the Bulgarian King and the Byzantine model had not such initial miniature (as H. Belting pointed out before him).

⁴⁴ Cf. for instance the comparison of Turnovo, the capital, to the Byzantine capital, in order to emphasize the city's brilliance and prestige, Iv. Dujcev, *op. cit.*, 25.

- ⁴⁵ P. Schreiner, "Probleme der Gräzisierung des bulgarischen Reiches im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert", in *Etudes balkaniques*, XIV, 1978, 104-114 (= P. Schreiner, *Studia Byzantino-Bulgarica*, Wien, 1986, 83-93). *Idem*, "Die Byzantinisierung der bulgarischen Kultur", in: *Kulturelle Traditionen in Bulgarien: Bericht über das Kolloquium der Südosteuropa-Kommission, 16.-18. Juni 1987, Göttingen*, 1989, 49-55. An elaborated study of this process in Bulgarian visual culture may be found in E. Bakalova, "Society and Art in Bulgaria in the 14th Century", in: *Byzantinobulgarica*, VIII, Sofia, 1986, 17-73.
- ⁴⁶ For the other images of Ivan Alexander among the miniatures of the *Chronicle*, see E. Bakalova, *op. cit.*, 23-32. Cf. *Idem*; "Ктиторските портрети на цар Иван Александър като израз на политическата и религиозната идеология на епохата", in: *Проблеми на изкуството*, 1985, 4, 45-57. Cf. T. Velmans, "La chronique illustrée de Constantin Manassès", in: *Byzance, les Slaves et l'Occident: Études sur l'art paléochrétien et médiéval*, London, 2001, 175-230.
- ⁴⁷ Iv. Dujcev, *op. cit.*, N 33.
- ⁴⁸ O. Treitinger, *op. cit.*, 129-136. Cf. C. Rapp, "Comparison, Paradigm and the Case of Moses in Panegyric and Hagiography", in: M. Whitby (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power ...*, cited above, 277-298. For the comparisons between David and Basil I see: G. Moravcsik, "Sagen und Legenden über Kaiser Basilios I", in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 15, 1961, 69. H. Maguire, "The Art of Comparing in Byzantium", in: *The Art Bulletin*, 1988, vol. 77, 88- 103.
- ⁴⁹ Special analysis of the meaning of the comparison of Ivan Alexander with David through this pictorial representation is to be found in my article "King David as a Model of a Christian Ruler: some visual sources" (forthcoming).
- ⁵⁰ Iv. Biliarsky, *Институциите на средновековна България: второ българско царство XII-XIV век.*, Sofia, 1998.
- ⁵¹ More on the portrait of Ivan Alexander in Bachkovo, see E. Bakalova, V. Kolarova, P. Popov, V. Todorov, *The Ossuary of the Bachkovo monastery*, ed. by E. Bakalova, Plovdiv, 2003, 117-124.
- ⁵² B. Filov, *Миниатюрите на Лондонското евангелие на цар Иван Александър и неговите миниатюри*, Sofia, 1934. *Idem*, "Die Miniaturen des Evangeliums Ivan Alexanders in London" in: *Byzantion*, IV, 1927-1928, 313-319. L. Jivkova, *Четвероевангелието на цар Иван Александър*, Sofia, 1980. E. Dimitrova, *The Gospel of Tsar Ivan Alexander*, London, British Library, 1994.

- ⁵³ S. Der Nersessian, "Two Slavonic Parallels of the Greek Tetraevangelia: Paris. gr. 74.", in: *The Art Bulletin*, IX, 3, 223-274.
- ⁵⁴ S. Dufrenne, "Deux chefs-d'oeuvres de la miniature du XI^e siècle", in: *Cahiers archéologiques*, 17, 1967, 177-191. S. Der Nersessian, "Recherches sur les miniatures du Parisinus graecus 74", in: *Jahrbuch der österreichische Byzantinistik*, 21, 1972, 109-117.
- ⁵⁵ J. Spatharakis, *The Portrait in Byzantine Illuminated Manuscripts*, Leiden, 1976, 65.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, 65. For this type of investiture see esp. S. Dufrenne, "Deux chefs-d'oeuvres ...", cited above, 187-191. V. Likhacev, "Скрипторий Студийского монастыря во второй половинь XI века", in: V. Likhacev, *Искусство книги. Константинополь XI в.*, Moscow, 1976, 80-82. The description of the last scene of Paris gr. 74 in A. Džurova, *1000 години българска ръкописна книга. Орнамент и миниатюра*, Sofia, 1981, 46 contains certain inaccuracies and its content is not completely understood.
- ⁵⁷ A. Grabar, "Une pyxide en ivoire à Dumbarton Oaks. Quelques notes sur l'art profane pendant les derniers siècles de l'empire Byzantin", in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 14, 1960, 127-134. Cf. T. Velmans, "Le portrait dans l'art des Paléologues", in: *Art et société à Byzance sous les Paléologues. Actes du colloque international organisé par l'Association des études byzantines*, Venise, 1971, 91-149.
- ⁵⁸ K. Wessel, "Kaiserbild", in: *Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst*, III, Stuttgart, 1976, 779-784, esp. 780.
- ⁵⁹ Of all the scholars who note these distinctive features (B. Filov, *Миниатюрите...*; A. Džurova, *op. cit.*, 44; J. Spatharakis, *op. cit.*, 67-70), only E. Kotseva (*Приписка 1350-1360 в сборнике Прывослава (Рукопись времен Иоанна Александра и Иоанна Шишмана, хранящаяся в Софийской Народной библиотеке им. Кирилла и Мефодия)*) not only interprets all nuances, but compares them with the known historical data and those of the colophon in a manuscript, containing 16 sermons by Gregory the Theologian (Sofia National Library nr. 647). In this colophon the scribe mentions that the manuscript was made at the court of Tsar Ivan Alexander and the "young Tsar Shishman".
- ⁶⁰ E. Kotseva, *op. cit.*, 257; IV. Dujcev, *Из старата българска книжнина. II. Книжовни и исторически паметници от Второто българско царство*, Sofia, 1944, 170.

- ⁶¹ K. Wessel, "Manuel II Paleologus und seine Familie. Zur Miniatur des cod. Ivoires A 53 des Louvres", in: *Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters. Festschrift H. Wentzel*, Berlin, 1975, 219-229. N. Oikonomides, "John VII Paleologus and the Ivory Pyxis at Dumbarton Oaks", in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 31, 1977, 329-339. I. Spatharakis, *op. cit.*, 139-144, fig. 93.
- ⁶² The portraits of Orthodox rulers which have come down to us show that similar ideas were expressed in the portrait compositions of the kings and rulers of all Orthodox states, including Serbia, Russia, Georgia and Moldavia. F. Kämfer has given particularly valuable information in this respect in his book *Das russische Herrscherbild von den Anfängen bis zu Peter dem Grossen (Studien zur Entwicklung politischer Ikonographie in Byzantinischen Kulturkreis)*, Recklinghausen, 1978. Cf. of the extensive bibliography see among others V. Djurić, "Три догађаја у српској држави XIV века и njihov одјек у сликарству", in: *Зборник за ликовне уметности*, 4, Novi Sad, 1968, 91-92; M. A. Musicescu, "Introduction à une étude sur le portrait de fondateurs dans le Sud-Est Européen. Essais de typologie", in: *RESEE*, 17, 1969; G. Alibegashvili, *Светский портрет в грузинской средневековой монументальной живописи*, Tiflis, 1979.
- ⁶³ Here I would like to recall the words of Dimitri Likhachev on the "literary etiquette". See his "Литературный этикет", in: *Поэтика древнерусской литературы*, Leningrad, 1971, 111.
- ⁶⁴ S. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, 1981, 12.

Eulogy of the Bulgarian King Ivan Alexander in the Sofia Psalter of 1337

.....
“For as we have gathered let us praise God and sing a solemn song to Christ, the King -crown-giver and Lord (Master?) of us all, who has given to us the great commander and King of Kings, the great Ivan Alexander, the most orthodox of all, ... and leader in war, and mighty in battles, gracious (amiable?), benevolent, pink-cheeked, kind-sighted, handsome in appearance, with bent knees and upright walking, gazing sweetly over all, righteous beyond words, judge of orphans and widows. Hence I will say, who, among us, after having seen the King, would return grieving to his home? In his military might, he seems to me like a second Alexander of ancient times. Like him, [Ivan Alexander] from the very beginning [of his reign] took many cities with fortitude and courage. So he appears before us, the great Ivan Alexander, ruling over all the Bulgarians, he, who has proven himself in difficult and hard battles; who has powerfully overcome the Greek King and when the latter was at a loss, he captured him and took the fortified towns: Nessebar [Messambria on the Black Sea] and all of the Pomorie [the Black sea Coast] together with Romania, as well as Bdin and all of the lower Danube even to the Morava river. The rest of the towns and villages, countries and countryside fell at his feet. And having captured all his enemies, he triumphed over them establishing a solid silence in the Universe. It seems to me that this King appeared as a new Constantine among the Kings in his faith and piety, heart

and character, having as scepter the triumphant Cross; when bearing and showing this standard he drove away and dismissed all resisting and arrogant forces ... No other since the first [Bulgarian] kings seems to me equal to this great King Ivan Alexander, Glory and Praise of all Bulgarians. Look, all you, young and old, and raise your flags in combats for the glorious King of Bulgaria. Come forth, now you, patriarchs and bishops, monks and ascetics, judges, slaves and freemen, dignitaries and all the army (or king's men); and rejoice you with inexpressible joy and render glory to the great King Christ our God, the wreath-giver, and raise to him your victorious song: Oh, Holy Trinity, save the Bulgarian King, protect and strengthen him, give him victory over his enemies and ... endow him with longevity, O Lord of us all. For I, while weaving joyful praises, say: 'Rejoice, o King of the Bulgarians, King of Kings. Rejoice chosen by God, rejoice o merciful, Rejoice, o crowned by God! Rejoice guarded by God! Rejoice leader in war-times! Rejoice, intercessor of the faithful! Rejoice Bulgarian Glory and Praise! Rejoice King Alexander! Rejoice Ivan! Rejoice, together with your pious spouse, Queen Theodora! Rejoice, together with your sweet children - Michael King, and Asen, and Sratzimir and Asen! Rejoice, o, town of Tarnovo! Rejoice his towns and countries! Rejoice thee and rejoice again for that you have such a King! Let God strengthen them in their power and let God offer them heavenly Kingdom and let him settle them in the palace of heaven for ever, now and ever and unto ages of ages. Amen'''.

(translated from old Bulgarian)

Приложение:

[illegible][illegible]

[illegible]